Remarks

Claims 1-13 and 15-30 are currently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 27 have been amended. Applicants assert that the claims are now in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner in June, 2005. During the interview, deficiencies in the Williams and Duck references relative to subject matter of the present application were discussed. Namely, it was discussed how Williams and Guck fail to disclose that a remote office initiating contact with a main office and the main office automatically providing data and/or access rules to the remote office in response to the initiation of contact by the remote office.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 10, and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (US Pat 5,692,157) in view of Guck (US Pat 5,848,415). Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-17, and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Guck and further in view of Keyser (US Pat 5,025,373). Claim 5 is rejected as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Guck and further in view of Schaefer (US Pat 5,826,268). Claim 18 is rejected as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Guck and Keyser and further in view of Schaefer. Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Guck and further in view of Hamala (US Pat 5,345,586). Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Guck and further in view of Spencer (US Pat 6,356,909). Claims 27-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipner (US Pat 5,553,304) in view of Williams and in view of Guck. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action has rejected claim 1, 10, and 19 by stating that Williams discloses a most of the elements but fails to disclose a single permissible formatting standard rule being automatically sent to the remote office before data transmission. However, the Office Action states that Guck teaches a Get request with a the format of

the file being specified with the request automatically. The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to combine Williams with Guck to render these claims unpatentable. Claim 27 was rejected by inserting Lipner and applying Williams and Guck.

The independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 27 now recite that a single permissible formatting standard is automatically sent to the remote office by the main office in response to the initiation of contact by the remote office and prior to transferring data to the main office and that the data is formatted automatically and correctly according to the single permissible formatting standard prior transferring data to the main office. As a representative example, claim 1 recites, in part, wherein for each type of data transfer from the remote office to the main office there is an access rule that comprises a single permissible formatting standard rule used by the main office for data transfers of that type, and wherein the formatting standard rule for the data transfer of that type is automatically sent to the remote office by the main office in response to the initiation of contact by the remote office and before the remote office sends entered data to the main office such that the entered data is automatically correctly formatted to be compatible with the single permissible format used by the main office for the data transfer of that type prior to the entered data being transferred to the main office.

Thus, no user intervention is required to cause the single permissible formatting standard to be sent from the main office to the remote office since the main office automatically sends the formatting standard to be sent in response to the remote office initiating contact and no user intervention is required to cause the data to be automatically and correctly formatted to be compatible with the single permissible formatting standard prior to the data being sent to the main office. None of the cited references disclose such automatic transfer and implementation of formatting standard rules.

The Office Action has conceded that Williams fails to disclose the automatic sending of the formatting standard since it is sent in response to the user selecting the change format option. However, Guck also fails to disclose the elements as well because Guck submits the Get request in response to user activity. Specifically in relation to FIG. 1, Guck states "[t]he user then performs a "get" request for the document he seeks in accordance with the protocol that he is using." Thus, the "get" request including the file

type required is submitted from the requesting client computer on the basis of user activity. The client computer that sends the formatting standard is initiating the contact. Thus, Guck fails to account for the deficiencies of Williams because Guck does not disclose sending the formatting standard automatically as a result of that which is being sent the formatting standard having initiated the contact.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 10, 19, and 27 are allowable over the cited combination. Furthermore, claims 1 and 27 include additional recitations allowable over the cited combination of references, including the Lipner reference, in that the main office applies equations stored in the database, as steps within a dimension of the database in relation to claim 1 or as elements of the database as in claim 27, to the data that is being received. Thus, these claims are allowable for these additional reasons.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, 15-18, 20-26, and 28-30 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Additionally, one or more of these dependent claims recite additional features that are patentable over the cited references, such as claim 9 which introduces multiple remote offices.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-13 and 15-30 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees other than the fee for continued examination are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2005

Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093